

provided, and so the precedent now will be changed. If you do advance the bill, and it was a hundred and some thousand, to annualize that into LB 1250, it would require an additional \$366,000. And if the bill is advanced, why then I would be prepared to offer that amendment to the salary bill in 1250A so that the salary could be continued at this level for the following year. The real decision you also should keep in mind, since we have been unable to deal with providing some improved structure for other state employees in the negotiations on salaries, in the case of the teachers, that is comparable to local governments and most of the problems involved for the rest of state government, at least, is not involved or is not the same with instructors but 1250 as it currently stands would prohibit going to the CIR for one year. I also have an amendment that would make an exception to that provision for the teachers as long as the salaries are included. The important thing for you to realize when you vote yes on this bill, not only are you approving the 100,000 plus contained in 1256, but you also are obligating yourself to 366,000 in LB 1250A.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Okay, thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Landis, please, on LB 1256.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise to support LB 1256, and as far as precedence setting, it seems to me that we have in LB 1250 indicated that in a coming year with the use of a consultant, with the use of some good faith discussions on all the parties, we hope to have a new method for dealing with state employee wages and salary determinations, and to integrate the recent Supreme Court decisions into our own budgetary process. What is being urged upon us by the Claims Board and by the Business and Labor Committee is simple justice. Not on the same topic but on a different topic, and yet there is a relationship, for the last couple of years I have had reason to come to each of you and ask whether or not you would support a Commonwealth settlement, and this body has said to me, repeatedly, if we owe it, if a court tells us we owe it, we will pay it. If we are not bound to pay it as a matter of law, we don't want to pay it, and I have understood that distinction between a moral obligation and a legal obligation. It was an unhappy fact of life for a lot of Commonwealth depositors that this distinction was so important to my colleagues but, repeatedly, this body said what we owe legally we will pay and no more, and now with the Business and Labor Committee, we are facing the question of what we legally owe will we pay. This isn't just a committee amendment. This bill, if you will, comes